

REMARKS

Claims 20, 28 and 32 are amended. Claims 20-32, as amended, remain in the application. No new matter is added by the amendments to the claims.

The Rejections:

In the Final Office Action dated December 2, 2005, the Examiner rejected Claims 20-32 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding Claims 20, 28 and 32, the Examiner stated that the word "means" is preceded by the word(s) "attachment point" in an attempt to use a "means" clause to recite a claim element as a means for performing a specified function. However, since no function is specified by the word(s) preceding "means," it is impossible to determine the equivalents of the element, as required by 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. See *Ex parte Klumb*, 159 USPQ 694 (Bd. App. 1967).

The Examiner advised that Claims 20, 28 and 32 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph.

The Examiner advised that Claims 21-27 and 29-31 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant's Response:

Applicant amended Claims 20, 28 and 32 to remove the word "means" and overcome the rejection.

In view of the amendments to the claims, Applicant believes that the claims of record now define patentable subject matter over the art of record. Accordingly, an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

00011327190001667344-1

6